PMAE.	_DOYLE_	_AGF

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

PAGE 01

JAN 0 5 2009 PTO/SB/21 (07-06)

Under the Panemerik Reduction Act of 1995	U.S . no persons are required to respond to a	Patent and T	radament Office:	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	
	Application Number	10/865,256		A PART CHILD CONTROL HUMBER	
TRANSMITTAL	Filing Date	09/20/2003	09/20/2003 KURUP, SHREE		
FORM	First Named Inventor	KURUP, Ş			
	Art Unit	3711			
(to be used for all correspondence after initial	Examiner Name filing)	MS. LEGE	MS. LEGESSE		
Total Number of Pages In This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	KURUP-3			
	ENCLOSURES (Check a	I that apply	<u></u>		
Fee Transmittal Form	Drawing(s)		Atter	Allowence Communication to TC	
Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers	Licensing-related Papers		el Communication to Board peals and Interferences	
Amendment/Reply	Petition			al Communication to TC al Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)	
After Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			ietary Information	
Affidavita/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation		Statu	s Latter	
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer		Other	Enclosure(s) (please identify	
· ·	Request for Refund	•	L below	r);-	
Express Abandonment Request	CD, Number of CD(s)				
Information Disclosure Statement			•		
Certified Copy of Priority	Landscape Table on C	:0			
Document(s) RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT BRIEF ATTN: REGINALD TYSO				ATTN: REGINALD TYSON.	
Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application SPECIALIST. APPELLANT RATIFIES THE PREVIOUSLY FILED BRIEF. A COPY OF F 15, SIGNED, IS ALSO DISCLOSED. IF A PROBLEM PLEASE TELEPHONE 978-667-30				ED BRIEF. A COPY OF PAGE	
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	EMAIL ROBNATHANS@AOL.COM	THANK YO	U. PAGE 4 EN	CLOSED ALSO (STATUS OF	
Uniter 37 CFR 1.52 0F 1.53	CLAINS)				
2001					
Firm Name	TURÉ OF APPLICANT, ATTO	JKNET, U	RAGENT		
ROBERT NATHANS					
Signature Wolling					
Printed name ROBERT NATHANS					
Date 01/05/2009	01/05/2009 Reg. No. 19,558				
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING					
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450. Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:					
Signature M. M.					
Typed or printed name ROBERT NATHA	INS		Date	01/05/2009	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to fite (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, cell 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-40 and 50-54 are cancelled.

JAN 0 5 2009

Claims 41-49, 55 and 56, the claims on appeal, all stand rejected under 35 U,S.C. 103(a).

The outer adhesive layer not only supports the lens but has the convenient dual function of receiving and supporting a label carrying the aforesaid message upon the eye patch.

CLAIMS 49 AND 43, 44

It is respectfully submitted that the use of an old discarded lens in applicant's eye patch is a new and unobvious use of an old lens that would otherwise be thrown away. Who would think of using her old normally discarded lens in this highly unusual manner? The user of applicant's novelty eye patch who uses an old discarded lens in the eye patch is not a manufacturer saving manufacturing costs as asserted by the examiner. The supplier of the eye patch does not supply the old discarded lens of the wearer. The wearer has already paid for her new up to date corrective lenses. This clever feature should be independently patentable and is not suggested by the references.

CLAIMS 55, 56

Claims 55 and 56 are quite similar to claim 41. While eye patches are widely understood to be flexible, this limitation has been dropped since it may be practical to provide an eye patch that is relatively ridged, which however may complicate having the eye patch fit securely upon the user's face. Also the fastening devices could constitute something other than adhesives like, for instance, elastic straps about the wearer's head.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert L. Nathans

Registration # 19,558.

978-667-3060; robnathans@aol.com